REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 11, 13-15, 17, and 19-23 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent claims. Claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 11, 14-15, and 17 have been amended, claims 3, 5, 10, 12, 16, and 18 have been cancelled, and claims 21-23 have been added.

Drawings

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acceptance of Applicants' formal drawings filed concurrently with the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have canceled claims 3, 5, 10, 12, 16, and 18 in this response and, therefore, rejections to these claims are moot.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, and 14 to include the limitation of "*in response to retrieving the master profile, using the master profile for one or more computing tasks*" in order to clearly claim a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Support for this amendment can be found in Applicants' specification on page 4, lines 16-21, page 5, lines 18-21, and page 12, lines 16-21. Therefore, no new matter is added with such amendments. In addition, Applicants have amended independent claim 14's preamble to clearly satisfy the useful result aspect of 35 U.S.C. § 101's practical application requirement. As a result of the amendments discussed above, Applicants request the removal of the 101 rejection to Applicants' independent claims.

Claims 2, 4, 6-7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19-20 are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon independent claims 1, 8, or 14. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 6-7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19-20 also provide a useful, concrete, and tangible result, and Applicants request the removal of the 101 rejection to these claims.

Claim Rejections - Alleged Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Raymond (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0158899, hereinafter "Raymond"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Applicants have canceled claims 3, 5, 10, 12, 16, and 18 in this response and, therefore, rejections to these claims are moot.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to distinctly claim that the limitations are performed without user intervention in an autonomic computing environment. As amended, Applicants' claim 1 is directed towards a method of managing a client profile with limitations comprising:

- automatically sending a client request to a computing device in an autonomic computing environment without intervention from a user, the client request including a request for master profile information;

- receiving the master profile information from the computing device in the autonomic computing environment without informing the user, wherein the master profile information corresponds to a master profile and includes a master profile location;

- in response to receiving the master profile information from the computing device, automatically retrieving the master profile using the master profile location in the autonomic computing environment without intervention from the user; and

- in response to retrieving the master profile, using the master profile for computing one or more computing tasks.

Applicants' invention updates profiles on a client computer without intervention from the client computer's user in order to achieve an autonomic computing environment. Support for this amendment can be found in Applicants' Figure 4 (reference numerals 412 and 427) and corresponding text in Applicants' specification on page 14, line 1 through page 15, line 2. Therefore, no new matter is added with such amendments. Particularly, Applicants claim "*automatically retrieving the master profile using the master profile location in the autonomic computing environment **without intervention from the user.***"

In contrast, Raymond depends upon user intervention in order to determine whether to retrieve particular files. Raymond states:

"*The specified information is presented on a customized display for consideration and **interaction by the network administrator**.*" (page 2, para. 15)

"*Editor module 1402 displays editing windows or views through a portal view editing graphical user interface (GUI) 1404 that includes a user interface **through which the network administrator can make editing commands**. ..Editor module 1402 is invoked when the network administrator makes an entry that indicates a desire to edit a portal view window...When the user graphical[ly] selects this edit icon*, portal view display GUI 1104 generates a module view edit request 1420 that is received by editor module 1402*" (page 11, para. 124-126, emphasis added)

As can be seen from the above excerpts, Raymond completely depends upon an administer to dictate actions of Raymond's invention, which is different than "*automatically sending a client request...**without intervention from a user**, receiving the master profile information ... **without informing the user**, ..and automatically retrieving the master profile ...**without intervention from the user**"* as claimed by Applicants. Therefore, since Raymond does not teach all of the limitations of Applicants' claim 1 as amended, amended claim 1 is allowable over Raymond. Claim 8 is an information handling claim including similar limitations as claim 1 and, therefore is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable. Claim 14 is a computer program product claim including similar limitations as claim 1 and, therefore is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.

Notwithstanding the fact that claim 2 is dependent upon claim 1 and, therefore, allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable, claim 2 adds limitations to claim 1 of:

- comparing a revision time of an existing profile with a revision time of the master profile;
- determining whether to perform the retrieving based upon the comparing; and
- performing the retrieving in response to the determination.

Applicants have amended claim 2 to include the limitations of original claim 3 in this response. Applicants "*compare a revision time of an existing profile with a revision time of the master profile*" in order to determine whether Applicants' client computer already includes the lasted version of the master profile. Raymond never teaches such limitation because Raymond depends upon an administrator to determine whether to download particular files. The Office Action uses an excerpt from Raymond to reject Applicants' "comparing" limitation. After further review, however, Raymond does not teach such limitation. Raymond's excerpt states:

> "As will be described in detail below, display module 1102 displays a series of windows each allocated to the display of management information provided by a particular portal module 204. The size of each such window is determined by the output type attributes specified in registration file 308. Each module view window is located within a column as defined by column specification 804 which in turn are included in a sheet as defined in sheet specification 802." (page 11, para. 122)

As can be seen from the above excerpt, Raymond never teaches or suggests comparing revision times of existing profiles to master profiles as claimed by Applicants. Rather, Raymond merely discusses that portal window sizes are determined by registration file 308's output type attributes, which has nothing to do with files that are being retrieved, but rather the **display format** of Raymond's user interface window. Therefore, since Raymond does not teach or suggest, in whole or in part, all the limitations included in claim 2 as amended, amended claim 2 is allowable over Raymond. Claim 9 is an information handling claim including similar limitations as claim 1 and, therefore is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable. Claim 15 is a computer program product claim including similar limitations as claim 1 and, therefore is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.

New Claims

Claim 21 has been added, which is a method claim that is dependent upon claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable. In addition, claim 21 adds the limitation to claim 1 of "*wherein one of the computing tasks*

Docket No.   Page 11 of 12   Atty Ref. No. R323
RPS920030161US1
Challener, et al. - 10/718,940

is printing to a printer, and wherein the master profile includes printing properties that correspond to the printer." The art of record never teaches or suggests printing to a printer using printing properties included in the master profile that is received in an autonomic computing environment. and, therefore, claim 21 is allowable over the art of record. Support for this limitation is included in Applicants' specification on page 8, lines 9-24 and, therefore, no new matter is added.

Claim 22 is an information handling system claim including the same limitation as claim 21 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21 is allowable. Claim 23 is computer program product claim including the same limitation as claim 21 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21 is allowable.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicans respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By   /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/
Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorney for Applicants
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742